

Before the Board of Zoning Adjustment, D.C.

PUBLIC HEARING -- November 22, 1967

Appeal No. 9410 L. T. Adams, appellant.

The Zoning Administrator of the District of Columbia, appellee.

On motion duly made, seconded and carried, with Messrs. McIntosh and Hatton dissenting, the following Order was entered at the meeting of the Board on January 24, 1968.

EFFECTIVE DATE OF ORDER - July 31, 1968

ORDERED:

That the appeal for variance from the minimum lot area width, frontage and from the provisions of Section 1302 to permit subdivision and erection of two single-family dwellings at 745 - 10th St., SE., lot 842, Sq. 950 be granted.

FINDING OF FACTS:

- (1) The subject property is located in an R-4 District.
- (2) The subject property has a frontage of 27.5 feet on 10th St., SE., and a depth of 100.5 feet containing approximately 2763 square feet.
- (3) It is proposed to subdivide the property into two lots and to erect two single family row dwellings. The site abuts a 30 foot public alley at the rear and it is proposed to provide an off-street parking space for each dwelling.
- (4) Each of the proposed dwellings would be 13 by 9 feet and would contain three bedrooms and 2½ baths.
- (5) Section 3301 of the Zoning Regulations provides that row dwellings in the R-4 District must have a width of 18 feet and contain 1,800 square feet of area.
- (6) There are other lots in the area with a street frontage less than fourteen feet in width.
- (7) An apartment house abuts the subject property which is asserted to contain approximately six units.
- (8) There was opposition to the granting of this appeal registered at the public hearing. The Capitol Hill Restoration Society and the Capitol Hill Southeast Citizens Association support the granting of this appeal.
- (9) At its meeting of November 30, 1967 the Board denied this appeal with Messrs. Harps and Davis dissenting. The case was reconsidered after a request by the appellant and the note that an error was made in the zoning plat showing the property was zoned R-2 instead of R-4.

#9410

OPINION:

The Board is of the opinion that appellant has shown a hardship within the meaning of the variance clause of the Zoning Regulations, that refusal to grant the relief requested will prevent a reasonable use of the property as zoned, and that the granting of this appeal will not adversely affect the use of nearby and adjoining property nor impair the intent, purpose and integrity of the zone plan as embodied in the Zoning Regulations and Map.

BY ORDER OF THE D. C. BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT

ATTESTED:

By: James E. Bess  
JAMES E. BESS  
Secretary of the Board